

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

CODY J. JONAS,

Plaintiff,

Civil No. 08-243-AA

v.

ORDER

DOLORES EDSON, et al.,

Defendants.

AIKEN, District Judge.

Plaintiff's Amended Complaint (#10) is an improvement over the original complaint in that it deletes much of the immaterial details of his claims. However, the complaint does not comply with the court's order regarding alleging specific facts with regard to the defendants plaintiff seeks to hold liable.

The essence of plaintiff's claim appears to be that he was improperly disciplined for a rule infraction and was subsequently place in a "more restrictive environment."

However, plaintiff further alleges a laundry list of general claims that are unsupported by any specific

allegations of fact. For example, plaintiff alleges that defendants have "conspired to deprive plaintiff access to courts, to jail library,, communication with attorney, stole legal documents" ... and refused plaintiff "personal visits, personal telephone calls, religious activities (and) canteen" Amended Complaint (#10) p. 1-2.

In order to enable defendants to respond, plaintiff should allege facts as to each of these general claims, and particularly which individual defendant violated his rights. General allegations that defendants conspired to violate his rights are insufficient to state a claim. In addition, if plaintiff is claiming that his due process rights were violated with respect to his disciplinary hearing he should allege in what respects the disciplinary process was constitutionally deficient.

Plaintiff is allowed 30 days from the date of this order to file an amended complaint that complies with the pleading requirements set forth in the court's orders and advised that failure to file a legally sufficient amended complaint within 30 days of the date of this order will result in the dismissal of this action.

DATED this 1st day of July, 2008.

/s/ ANN AIKEN
Ann Aiken
United States District Judge